THEOLOGY

VOL. LIX AUGUST, 1956 No. 434

Editorial

WE have been looking into the Chronicle of the Convocation of Canterbury with a view to finding out more about the non-authorization of the Authorized and Revised Versions of the Bible. When the question of revision came on in the 19th century, the A.V. had for so long been everywhere read in church that it seems at first to have been generally assumed that it, and it alone, was authorized for the purpose. Thus on 10 February 1870 the Bishop of Salisbury (G. Moberly) declared in Convocation that eventually "reference should be made to Government in order to obtaining the same authority for the new revision as for the present translation". But at the next group of sessions (in the following May), divines like Dean Alford of Canterbury and Dean Stanley of Westminster, who knew the facts of the case, pointed out that the A.V. never had been formally approved by either the Church or the State. No one could gainsay Stanley when he said: "The present Authorized Version can be—I do not say that it is desirable, but it can be—corrected by individual Clergymen, because it is not part of the Act of Uniformity, or of the Prayer-book as incorporated in the Act." The Lessons at morning and evening prayer stand "upon a totally different footing" from those parts of the A.V. "which have been incorporated in the Gospels and Epistles in the Prayer-book" and so are "part of the law of the land". It is true that a subsequent speaker told of a clergyman in his diocese who "committed two ecclesiastical offences, one of which was the refusal to bury the body of a Dissenter, and the other the reading of the Douay version of the Lessons". "The result was he was prohibited from officiating for three years", but the speaker suggested no good reason why a similar fate awaited anyone else who departed from the text of the A.V. Little interest, however, was exhibited in the question of authorization. During the July 1870 sessions of Convocation Lord Alwyne Compton (afterwards Bishop of Ely), who incidentally referred to "the so-called 'Authorized' Version (I say 'so-called' because where the authorization comes from no one knows)", probably expressed the hopes of those who favoured revision when he said: "We look forward to our revised version at some future time, supposing it to be better than the Authorized Version now existing, working its way into general use; Clergymen who think it better will use it in their churches, and the idea is that in the lapse of time it will come to be the version used in the Church of England and by English Christians generally."

Nevertheless, in May 1881, when the Revised N.T. was ready, the Bishop of London (J. Jackson), also speaking in Convocation, still seems to have anticipated that there would be a formal authorization

of it. "The time will come (how soon we know not)," he said, "when it will be received as the Authorized Version, and by some authority (I know not what) be permitted to be read in churches." Apparently the belief or the hope persisted that the A.V. had actually been authorized. Lord Selborne is said obligingly to have conjectured that the authority came from an order in council which had been destroyed!

In February 1886 there was to have been a debate in the Upper House on the use of the Revised Version in churches. In short speeches the Bishop of Bath and Wells (Lord A. C. Hervey) proposed and the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (C. J. Ellicott) seconded the following resolution: "That in the opinion of this House there is nothing illegal in using the Revised Version when reading the Lessons in church." But it was near the end of a sitting and the House was so thin that no debate took place. The motion was withdrawn and, so far as we can discover, the matter was left there—and has remained there ever since.

When the project for a new English translation of the Bible came before Convocation in May 1947 the Bishop of Truro (J. W. Hunkin) said that "it would not be until the work was done, and the translation ready, that the question of what form or degree of authorization rightly to be accorded to it would arise". If the precedents of the A.V. and of the R.V. are followed, no authorization will be needed or accorded. The N.E.T. will be left to work its way by its intrinsic merits, and the extent to which it comes into use in public worship will depend on the good sense of those responsible for its conduct. As we have already pointed out, there is nothing to prevent them now from reading the Lessons from the Revised Standard Version or from existing modern translations. The Dean of Winchester said in May 1947 that "a modern translation of the Bible could be perfectly reverently and suitably read in church", and that in Winchester Cathedral Second Lessons from the Epistles had sometimes on weekdays been read from Moffatt's and Knox's translation with happy results, especially in the case of the latter. The Epistles and Gospels in the Prayer-book may still be on a different footing, though we have often heard at Holy Communion Epistles and Gospels read that are not in the Book of Common Prayer, and variations from the text of the A.V. are commonly made in those that are.

We wish therefore to retract the statement we made in April that "the Church of England is the only church in England which does not allow the Bible to be read in church in any version later than that of 1881". We would, however, reiterate what we were specially concerned to say then, namely that "it is desirable that congregations shall now become accustomed to hearing alongside the A.V. a more modern version and one that has more to commend it than the R.V."

* * * * *

The need felt in the Church of England by those who are called upon to teach "Christian Ethics" for good text-books on the subject is so great that we would call their attention to a book which is aimed

not at theological students but at the general reader. This is *Doing the Truth: a summary of Christian Ethics,* by Dr James A. Pike,[1] Dean of the Cathedral of St John the Divine, New York City. It is a volume in the "Christian Faith Series", which is being edited in the U.S.A. by Dr Reinhold Niebuhr and is being published in this country by Victor Gollancz. Dr Pike's approach to the subject and way of developing his theme are to our mind both theologically and psychologically as refreshing as they are satisfying. His theme is that the Christian ethic is one of vocation, not of rewards and punishments nor of absolute laws nor of abstract principles nor of purely existential situations. "God has chosen us to be co-creators with Him in finishing His creation, in the continuing work of the redemption of men, and in the task of building all men into community." It is an ethic conceived in terms of God's call to us, of our failure to live up to our vocation, of his forgiveness and acceptance of us (justification), and of our grateful response for what he has done (sanctification). On this theological foundation, which is interpreted with regard to the findings of psychology and sociology, Dr Pike proceeds to survey the different areas of social and personal life, always showing a keen awareness of the ambiguities that are involved in moral decision. He firmly relates ethics to worship, using the Anglican liturgical tradition for purposes of illustration. One might almost say of his book what he says of the Bible itself, namely that it is not to be regarded "as an 'answer-book' in relation to particular ethical questions; but it does manifest throughout, in 'divers manners and sundry places', the meaning of vocation under God, the scope of obligation, the scale of priorities, the importance of motive, the inner character of goodness, the danger of rationalization, and the drama of the redemption". So far as its content goes, then, we praise this book highly. Unfortunately, for English readers the form and style leave a good deal to be desired. The English edition appears to be a photographic reproduction of the American original, in which only an occasional misprint has been corrected. An American background and American readers are naturally presupposed. This, however, is not perhaps so serious a disadvantage as frequent infelicities of expression and lack of finish or polish in the writing. We say this, despite our admiration for American idiom at its best and most concise. "Discorrelation", "vocated", "judgmental", etc., are, we suppose, good American usage, but need such words be inflicted upon us in books published in England? We are disposed to echo a lament of Bishop Stephen Neill, when reviewing an important American book in the current number of the *Scottish Journal of Theology*: "It is a pity that some revision of the text for the English edition could not have been carried through." So revised, and supplied with an index, *Doing the Truth* could have been recommended without qualification: as it is, we hope it will be studied in preference to some native products that *faute de mieux* are used in our seminaries.

[1] Gollancz, 12s. 6d.

Toleration[1]

THE 16th century used the word in something like its modern sense but there was far less of the thing than of the name for it. Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth I all burned people for their religious opinions. Fr Philip Hughes, in the second volume of his great book on *The Reformation in England*, has an unforgettable chapter on the cruelty of that age. Catholics burned Protestants and Protestants burned Catholics, and Protestants of any shade were ready and willing to burn any slightly darker or lighter. They were all in it together: St Thomas More, Gardiner, Cranmer, Ridley, Knox; not one of them is innocent of blood. Even the "judicious Hooker" shared their views.

From the beginning of the next century the word took on a more official colour; it is now the permission by the government of opinions which were not that of those who happened to be in authority: an idea not carried out with any enthusiasm by Laud or the Presbyterians, by Cromwellians or Cavaliers. Milton's protest against the muzzling of the Press by the Long Parliament is one of the classics of pamphlet literature, but it had little effect. Historians are agreed that almost invariably intolerance provokes intolerance, and when their opportunity came the Cavaliers repaid the Puritans in their own coinage. Sir Arthur Bryant, an historian with a genius for generalization, says that when Charles II was king, toleration was the most unpopular word in the language. Among the ecclesiastically minded that may have been so, but among the educated laity there was an outburst of anticlericalism, a cry of "a plague on all theology", and a denunciation of creeds as leading to the "persecuting, burning, cursing, damning of men for not subscribing to the words of men as the words of God".[2] And this must be read against the background of the Thirty Years' War; this did not stop men murdering in the name of God, it merely taught many of them to stop believing in God. Religion was seen by millions as a curse if taken seriously, but otherwise as a joke.[3] That was when modern atheism began.

The claim is often made that in the 17th century it was the English Nonconformists who won the battle for toleration. But it was toleration for themselves in which Independents and Presbyterians believed, and it was to get this that at times they supported proposals which went to the point of involving toleration for Roman Catholics. The first great Anglican who stated a reasoned case for toleration for non-Anglicans was John Locke, one of the main architects of the Church and Realm of England that we have inherited. Even Locke, as is well known, hesitated to tolerate atheists and Roman Catholics, the former because their principles would undermine the constitution of society, the latter because they owe allegiance to an alien power. But he died, as he declared, "in perfect charity with all men,

[1] The substance of a lecture delivered in Scarborough, 20 April 1955.
[2] Chillingworth, *The Religion of Protestants*.
[3] H. Agar, *Declaration of Faith*, p. 33.

and in sincere communion with the whole Church of Christ, by whatever name Christ's followers please to call themselves".

Locke died in 1704, and the 18th century took for granted that it sailed the course that he had set. But it was neither so entirely civilized as it claimed to be, nor so really tolerant as it thought it was. Gallio, in the King James Version of the Acts, is its ideal: sophisticated apathy—anything, indeed, rather than enthusiasm. But the cloven hoof was revealed in the Deist habit of dictating to God, as in the Roman Catholic assumption that they knew about it all. The intellectual humility which is the creative intuition of any true toleration is shown in Joseph Butler. In a universe so vast as this is, man can know but an insignificant corner of it, and understand nothing of its design and ultimate purpose. He must be grateful, then, that revelation provides him with a tiny glimmer of light with which to walk. It is not his to answer all the questions he would like to ask—that is not why he is here—but to do his duty carefully.

Roman Catholic emancipation in Britain was carried against the opposition of the Church and the Tories. Through the whole story that note recurs: toleration for everybody, except Roman Catholics. Granville Sharp, of the Clapham Sect, was taught in his youth "to love the Quaker, to be kind to the Presbyterian, to pity the Atheist, and to endure even the Roman Catholic". And when Robert Browning was a boy, attending with his father an Independent conventicle in South London, he was curious to learn how far the preacher's voice would carry. Deliberately he went late one Sunday, and while still half a street away from the chapel he heard the familiar booming: "I'm very sorry to say it, beloved brethren, but it is an undoubted fact that Roman Catholic and midnight assassin are synonymous terms."

The Rev. J. Langmead Casserley has said that toleration of opinions other than our own about matters which seem to us of supreme importance and arouse in us passionate convictions is as rich and rare a grace from God as ever. But, as he would agree, it is in fact more positive than that. It is the will to appropriate what is true and right in every man's belief and practice, to extract the gold from every ore. Communism, humanism, the new psychologies, Aldous Huxley, Immanuel Kant, logical positivism, spiritualism, Christian Science, the pentecostal sects, and even Roman Catholicism: not one of these is completely wrong, and the Christian must be aware of what in human need which each one meets. That is toleration.

The Synoptic Jesus was terrifyingly tolerant, a dangerous threat to what theologians, with their genius for abstraction, call the moral order. He told an adulteress, who had not said she was sorry, "I don't condemn you; go, and don't sin again". He had a story of a young wastrel who was driven home rather by his stomach than by his conscience, whose father gave him a good hug and did not so much as mention forgiving him. Jesus said, Judge not (and the Fourth Gospel enlarges on that). He was as far as could be from the life-changers and moral rearmourers, knowing that the outcasts and prostitutes will be

in the queue in front of the professional religionists. He liked to be with them and, more significantly, they liked to be with him. Is not this Christian charity, to take men as you find them, "with a genial friendliness"?

It would be difficult for a thoughtful man to read the words of Jesus without recognizing that personal freedom, adult spiritual maturity, is what our Lord hopes for all who are attracted to him. That is what he appeals to and will help and stimulate: freedom from inward slavery, of course, from a perverted will and inordinate affections, but freedom, also, from the idea of God as, primarily, not a Father but a Lawgiver, and from what goes with that false notion, the tyranny of the expert in the sphere of religion. The Scribes taught from authorities—"Rabbi so-and-so said such-and-such"—but just because he appealed to each man's conscience and common sense—"He that has ears, let him hear"—he taught with authority. And when he said, "You have heard that it was said to the *ancients,* but I say to *you*", it was not that he was substituting his own *ipse dixit* for Exodus or Leviticus—rewriting the Law, as some have said —but he was appealing from their memory of what they had read or been told, to their insight, what they *knew* to be good and true. Although we are ignorant and prejudiced, it is at our own peril that we say that a thing is good, if it does not impose itself on our own sense of values, our insight and common sense. It cannot be my duty to obey what I cannot understand, whoever is said to have said it.

Jesus, because he is the Son of the Father, believes utterly in freedom; that is one way to put it. Love requires independence. God does not want mental submission or unreasoning obedience. Dictatorships, it has been said, are governments of opinion; they supply their subjects with everything, including their beliefs and values. But the God of Jesus is no dictator—no infallible Hitler or infinite Stalin. He wants us to co-operate, loyally because with complete freedom, with the understanding and self-fulfilment that come from being, in our essential nature, his children. But there is another way to put it; if we believe what we are told because we are told it, we have no real regard for truth. Truth, as well as love, requires freedom. Or, as Jowett of Balliol put it, without independence of mind and opinion there can be no regard for truth.

But over all this lies the shadow of the twenty-third chapter of Matthew. "Sons of hell", "whited sepulchres", "offspring of vipers" are not notably tolerant epithets, but rather marks of unsympathetic and even ferocious opposition. C. G. Montefiore has pointed out, indeed, that there is no record of his saying a single word to win the Pharisees. It is surely a real difficulty for Christians. Are we prepared to say that Jesus could make allowances for publicans and harlots, but none for Pharisees? That he was angry at the sight of the harm the Pharisees did to men's souls, but had not the imagination to perceive that their formalism and hypocrisy were working more bitter desolation in themselves than in any who were being led astray by them? Why was his pity for them not greater than his anger with them?

What possible good could be accomplished by such a denunciation as this? A sweeping accusation against a class can never be justified in the case of every member of it, and the knowledge that it is not altogether deserved only makes them deaf to that part of it which is deserved. And even the worst members of the class ward off the attack by thinking of the best. This dealing with men in the mass was not his custom. But if he had shown one Pharisee who knew him intimately and loved him (Nicodemus or Joseph of Arimathea) how this externality and self-righteousness wounded him, such a revelation of the reaction of God might have won the Pharisee.

The presentment of Christ in Matthew is, indeed, much more emphatic, abrupt, peremptory than that in Luke. Matthew emphasizes the anti-Pharisaic elements in the sources more than the other Gospels. The word "hypocrites", for example, which imparts much of the violence to this speech, does not occur in the parallels in Luke. And "sons of hell" is peculiar to Matthew. "Offspring of vipers" may have been a vivid recollection of the language with which the Baptist greeted the Pharisees, for neither in Mark or Luke is the phrase attributed to the Lord. And it is above all to be noted that the phrase translated "woe to you" is at least as likely to mean "alas for you", implying sorrow rather than anger; it occurs with this meaning three times in Revelation 18; it is so used by Jesus himself when he stops on the Via Dolorosa to pity poor pregnant women and those with little ones in the terrible days that are coming. And in Mark 14. 21 it may speak out his heartbreak for Judas.

Can we imagine St Francis calling his opponents "whited sepulchres, children of hell, offspring of vipers"? Of him, Paul Sabatier said: "A great part of St Francis' power came to him through his systematic avoidance of polemics. The latter is always more or less a form of spiritual pride. It only deepens the chasm which it undertakes to fill up." But it is not thinkable that Jesus dropped below his own best, forgetting what he would be and becoming for a brief day or two almost what they expected him to be. It is a supreme burden for faith; for, if he failed, the race of men has never succeeded.

Toleration recognizes that truth is absolute and man is finite. Your experience and thinking apprehend part of reality; what I see is not quite the same. By *pooling our thoughts* the vision of each is purified, enriched, made more adequate for living. So far as the Church is the family of God, with its members established in Christ's freedom, not only the religion of saints and mystics but also, in its own way, the trust and obedience of all humbler believers are part of its authority. They are the "babes" to whom "these things" are revealed. The ultimate authority on what is or what is not of the Christian religion is the *consensus fidelium*, and the value of that consensus is lost so far as it is not freely arrived at but imposed from above.

Dogmatism, the passion to force your own meat and even your own mustard on another man's plate—and the cocksureness involved in it —are no guarantee of right thinking. Unreasoning certainty, so far from being connected with truth, may be the outward sign of obses-

sion; the psychologists interpret it as the mark of an idea emerging from the unconscious into the conscious mind. In practice, dogmatism means the worship of the dead, cringing before the crowd, counting noses with no thought of what is behind the noses: *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.* The professional religionist (it is feudalism in religion, Thomas Arnold said) has the first word and the last, and all those in between. The layman must swallow what is in the spoon and ask no questions; the whole duty of the Christian is to be teachable. Only so can he have a faith that will not falter in the face of the blood-curdling assertions of science or the confident sneers of humanism: hence the demand for dogmatic preaching. But, in fact, the only weapon and armour for the Christian layman are independence of judgment, spiritual insight, the strong conviction that uncriticized beliefs are not worth having, and the faculty of discerning what is true in what is new. William Temple once defined the savage as one who is hostile to new ideas and new practices as such.

All this implies that there are no infallibilities. No infallible Bible: Christians are united in recognizing the unique authority of the Bible, "the cradle in which Christ is laid", the Revelation of God, his saving Act, so that *all that men need to know* is in the Bible. But this has nothing to do with the present Pope's declaration[1] that the writers of the first eleven chapters of Genesis (which include Noah's flood and the genealogy of Abraham) were by divine inspiration preserved from all error in selecting and assessing the material they selected. Nor is it concerned with Dr Billy Graham's warning that we should watch the Middle East for developments in political and economic conditions because "the Scriptures foretell the invasion of the Middle and Near East by a vast coalition of forces from the north headed by Gog from the land of Magog".[2] And this view that the Bible is a glorified lumber room cluttered up with inerrant information about science, infallible propositions about God and enigmatic forecasts of world politics, gets no support from the Bible itself. "We know in part, and we teach in part," wrote the Apostle, "because we see in a mirror dimly."

And there is no infallible Church, because there is no reason why there should be. *Non in dialectica complacuit Deo salvum facere populum suum.* It is not by correct information, even about God, but by his forgiving Act and redeeming Presence, adhered to in trust and obedience. And no infallible Pope: a man who, in fact, believed in his own infallibility (with whatever qualifications or conditions) would be endangering his own sanity. And it is idle to protest that the Spirit shall guide the Church into all truth, for it is clear that he has not yet brought to that goal us or any actual empirical society or complex of societies which can put forward a reasonable claim to be called the Church. And to attribute infallibility to the Jesus of history, in spite of his express repudiation of it, denies the traditional

[1] *Humani Generis*, 1950.
[2] *Time and Tide*, 9 April 1955, p. 461.

Christian belief that the Word became truly human; all the evidence is that he looked out on the world with the eyes and mind of a Jew of the early Roman Empire. Not only so, but the record of him in the Gospels is riddled with contrasts, qualifications, developments, contradictions: of no act or saying of his can we be quite certain that it happened exactly as it is recorded. And his spiritual authority depends on the fallibility of the record, which perpetually asks for private judgment, which is the essentially spiritual principle.[1]

But toleration, in its widest legitimate sense, cannot mean that every movement and thinker and preacher are to be accepted at their own valuation, still less at the crowd's estimate, or that of the Press. And, in spite of our Lord's saying that he that is not against us is for us (Luke 9. 50), everything is not Christian which claims that name. And when Dr Billy Graham offers peace and assurance through belief in One who is not the weak, frail, effeminate hero of the calendars, the pale Galilean who could conquer nothing and nobody in this vitamin-stuffed age. "He was a real he-man: talk about your football players, he was physically the strongest man on earth"[2] (not unlike the glamorous six-foot-four Billy Graham), then he is not claiming you for Jesus, however monotonously he repeats that Name.

Much current evangelism "puts over" a Gospel which is either a substitute for psychiatry or a collaboration with it. Its concern is efficiency. Its appeal is to people who are looking for *happiness*. (It is arguable that that is the besetting temptation of this age.) If it brings Christ into their lives, it is that they may use him for their own ends. "Peace with God" is what you are offered, that you may feel warm and comfortable inside. But Macmurray is right in saying that it is high treason to say you believe in God because it is helpful to believe in him.

Then there is the problem of advertisement in relation to evangelism. The servant of the Lord shall not strive nor cry, nor cause his voice to be heard in the streets. The Greater London Crusade cost £167,378, and more than half of it went in advertising. But it is not, primarily, a question of the amount of advertising, or of its cost, but of the quality of it. Do the posters, leaflets, newspaper paragraphs, booklets appeal to the conscience and intelligence of the readers, or to their sense of what is smart or funny or up to date? To the childish or the childlike? If a man pays attention to them, is it because his mind has been rotted by the Yellow Press, or because he is groping for God and wants to worship? The ballyhoo about and by Dr Billy Graham vulgarizes Christianity, and there is no reason why toleration should be extended to that. But if anyone wants to read a *Christian* advertisement, he should see the first page of the appeal for a new organ put out by St Mary's, Beverley.

It is the pure in heart who see God; it is a personal decision. Unamuno's comment is that a man does not become good by believing in God; he comes to believe in God by being good. The choice

[1] William Temple, *Nature, Man and God*, p. 351.

[2] Alistair Cooke's report of a Madison Square Gardens service in the *Manchester Guardian*, 7 March 1955.

between the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ and the law of cause and effect is hardly at all a matter either of evidence or authority; so that intolerance is less an intellectual mistake than a personal blunder. Because private judgment is a duty, toleration is a privilege. Let us hear, then, the conclusion of the whole matter: every man's business is to mind his own business; for this is the whole duty of man.

ALBERT E. BAKER.

Christian Symphony

THE term "symphony" is found in the Greek New Testament, and is translated "music" in the parable of the Prodigal: "His elder son was in the field; and as he drew nigh to the house, he heard music" (Luke 15. 25). It is the A.V. and R.V. rendering of *συμφωνία*, to which should be added *συμφωνέω* translated "agree", as in Matt. 18. 19: "If two of you shall agree on earth . . . it shall be done for them of my Father"; and *σύμφωνος* rendered "consent", as in 1 Cor. 7. 5: "Except it be with consent"; and, lastly, *συμφώνησις* translated "concord" in 2 Cor. 6. 15: "What concord hath Christ with Belial?" This article is based upon the last quotation, where the Apostle links the symphonic concept with the Person of Christ as represented by his Church.

Though this approach to the Christian life may seem unusual, it is by no means discordant with St Paul's parabolic teaching. Again and again we find him comparing his ministry to common activities of his day. Sometimes he speaks of himself as of an architect—the "masterbuilder" of the A.V.—or he refers to runners in a stadium, to boxers who hit the wind or the object, or to the Roman legionary putting on his panoply, after being duly enlisted. All these similes are well known; but, for some curious reason, St Paul's musical illustration of the Christian life is almost unknown to the average Christian.

In the days of the Apostle, symphonic music was in a rudimentary stage, and may have meant little more than a "sounding together" of two or three instruments according to harmonic principles that may seem to our post-Wagnerian ears simply barbarous. But St Paul was endeavouring to apply the musical beauty of his day—or the impossibility of producing one by sharply opposed minds—to the Christian concepts of holiness and sin. It is therefore perfectly legitimate to apply our own symphonic experience to the same concepts, considering the "Christian Symphony" in relation to the composition, the composer, and to the public performance.

I. THE SYMPHONIC CREATION

When we go to a symphonic concert, we desire to derive aesthetic enjoyment from the performance of a work of art. But the concert, and the enjoyment we may derive from it, presuppose a *work*. In the

same way, any effect of regeneration to be achieved in the lives of the Corinthian pagans was meant to be a result of the awe, the "sense of God" that would overcome those Greeks as they came within the sphere of God's *work*, his "Church which was in Corinth".

Before a symphonic work can reach the public, it must incorporate at least the following elements: the idea, the idiom, and the material on which it is registered. In symphonic work, the idea may be derived from a literary source, producing a "symphonic poem"; or may illustrate various thoughts and situations, without being specifically "programmatic music", as the Pastoral Symphony by Beethoven; or, again, may be based on a musical impression without any admittedly extraneous source, as are, for instance, the symphonies by Sibelius and Vaughan Williams. But *without* an idea there is no symphonic work. The same applies to the Church. Anglican comprehensiveness allows of various schools of thought under the same episcopate; but whatever else may differ, there must be unity with regard to the basic idea of redemption by faith in God incarnate, and in making *that* the central message of the Church's ministry, "to the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in the heavenly places might be made known through the Church the manifold wisdom of God" (Eph. 3. 10).

Once the idea is conceived, the music must be communicated to others by means of an idiom understood by all musicians. Our modern notation—the way in which we write musical sounds—is very different from the notation used even before Guido d'Arezzo; but it is based upon the whole history of musical notation throughout the ages. To try a new system—as some eccentrics have done—would lead to confusion, and to complete collapse. And yet this is what some earnest Christians did, with the result that their Christianity dissipated into thin air. To achieve the aim for which the Church was conceived, the redemptive idea must be expressed in the idiom proper to itself, in the historic dogma of the Apostolic Church.

And now we must pass from the sublime to the almost ridiculous. When the composer has conceived the thought and is sufficiently equipped with the theoretic knowledge of musical grammar, form and instrumentation, he needs "manuscript" paper on which to write his work. This frail material, of little value in itself, then becomes the important vehicle to carry a "magnum opus" such as Beethoven's Ninth or Mahler's "Resurrection Symphony". And so do we, though only "earthly vessels", carry in our own persons the eternal message of Almighty God, as members of the Body of Christ.

II. The Composer

At a concert it is usually the conductor or some soloist that gets the largest applause; but, important as the artists are, it is the *composer* to whom this honour is due, although he is usually not to be seen. Any composition worth the name is not just a string of "nice tunes", nor even an exhibition of musical craftsmanship, but a projection into sound of the composer's secret, spiritual life. So

the Christian revelation is not simply a succession of high sounding principles, but the great unveiling of the mind and mystery of the Holy Trinity.

There are several levels at which we may appreciate a symphonic work. We may "like" it, without being able to say why; or we may appreciate the melodies and workmanship in the composition; but the fullest benefit is derived from it only when we discover the *creative thought* behind the music. What we call "the theme" is not of the essence of the work, but is only the exteriorization of the creative thought conceived in the mind of the composer. When we capture that essential thought, the theme is transfigured as a result of that realization. The composer can do no more than write a mere approximation of what he really desires to say; he is severely limited by the inadequate means which can be used to communicate his musical thoughts. Therefore, music lovers consider themselves really fortunate not when they merely attend a concert, or have a "score", but when the conductor had seen the composer and had found out from him all those things which he was simply unable to communicate through the score. Similarly, it is the creative thought behind the "theme" of redemption that the Church must apprehend, namely, God's desire for man's complete communion with his most holy Being (Rev. 21. 3–4).

The last task of the composer is to "work out" the thought conceived in his mind. This calls for musical grammar, harmony, counterpoint, orchestration, and, occasionally, vocal writing. The composer's skill in putting on paper what he hears in his mind is the measure of his work. In listening to J. S. Bach's "Passion according to St Matthew" we admire not only the creative thought underlying it, but also the exquisite workmanship of that composition, especially in its fugal sections. In fact, the most thorough English treatise on the art of fugue, written by Ebenezer Prout, draws the majority of its examples from the works of J. S. Bach, not only because of their fine musical subjects, but mainly on account of their masterly developments. And so it is the Church's task not only to proclaim the basic intention of God for his creation, but also to bring home to men and women, in the power of the Holy Ghost, the unsearchable riches of Christ, who, in every detail of earthly suffering, "became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation" (Heb. 5. 9).

III. The Performance

When a symphonic work is to be performed in public, the one man who can "make or break" it is the conductor. Before the time of Carl Maria Weber there were many conductors who took great delight in being "original", i.e. in interpreting a piece of music according to their whims. But owing to the work of men like Weber, Wagner, César Franck and Vincent d'Indy, musical ideas were so closely linked with literary concepts that conductors could no longer do what they liked; they had to become interpreters of the work before them instead of being fancy acrobats. The greatness of men like Toscanini or Bruno Walter lies in the fact that they refuse to "show

off", and strive to identify themselves with the work to such an extent that a true rendering of the composer's intention is achieved. The same obtains in the case of great soloists such as Kathleen Ferrier or Yehudi Menuhin. What the conductor (or soloist) is to the musical composition, the minister is to the Church militant. The supreme test of the clergyman's fitness does not lie in the dignity with which he conducts a service nor in the originality of his sermons, but in the measure in which he expresses "the mind of Christ" when administering the Word and the Sacraments.

We must now turn to those people who mediate written musical symbols to the ears of an audience, i.e. to the orchestra. Their task is to "live" the symphonic work; not just to play, but so to assimilate the music and to co-operate with the conductor that they become *one living instrument* upon which the conductor reproduces the intention of the composer. It is usual for the oboe to sound an "A" (when there is no piano; and a piano is not a usual component of the orchestra) to which "still, small voice" the other players attune their instruments before the performance. In the "Christian Symphony" the same obtains. The Church must take its spiritual guidance from the Holy Spirit, and then so *live* the message in Christian unity that it expresses God's creative intention in the work of his redemption.

Lastly, the audience. Every composition is written for an audience. The audience may not always be appreciative, even when of the best type. An illustration of this fact is Berlioz. When he first heard one of Beethoven's Symphonies, he said that Beethoven was a crank. Before long, however, he became one of the most enthusiastic conductors of those masterpieces. The Church must be prepared to be a "fool for Christ's sake" and fearlessly proclaim her Gospel to the world; as she perseveres in this ministry, the grace of God will add to her numbers "daily such as should be saved" (Acts 2. 47).

ERIC S. GABE.

A Literary Note

THE English Church cannot escape from the accidents attending her reform. The shape of her liturgy is determined by the theological cross-currents of the 16th century and her Thirty-nine Articles are a museum of controversy and compromise. Moreover, the prose to which we have been accustomed in her services is, as to its origin, in the main, and as to its form and style, entirely, that of pre-Elizabethan England. The seductions of these familiar cadences are very great. Indeed, anyone with an ear for prose may well have to ask himself, from time to time, whether he is not too much an Anglican to be a Christian.

Although one of the objects of the reformers was to enable the English people to worship in a language understanded of them, it is now only for a literate minority that the language of the Prayer Book has much of its original immediacy, and Anglicans must reflect

seriously on the loss of impact which that entails. The object of this note, however, is much more limited. It is to draw attention to a literary problem, which is also by implication a theological one, in the style of certain prayers and, in the first place, to the uneasiness a layman who has literary susceptibilities may feel at the introduction into mattins and evensong of prayers which are stylistically discordant.

It is a widespread custom to introduce prayers not in the Prayer Book after the third collect, either in addition to or (regrettably) in substitution for the set prayers. In either case, the stylistic contrast with the language of the office proper and (where they are said) with that of the concluding prayers is marked. The revisers of 1662, who added the concluding prayers, were sufficiently near to Cranmer's time and style to be able to produce work not discordant with his. The movement which, with Sprat and Dryden and Swift, rationalized English prose, was only on the point of beginning. Once that movement has gathered force we are *en plein dix-huitième siècle*, and though Johnson, in particular, had older traditions in his bones, it was henceforward impossible to write, in all sincerity, a language which rang true with that of the Prayer Books of 1549, 1552 and 1662.

There have not been lacking, in the self-conscious literary decadence of the 19th century and after, makers of sham antiques who were well satisfied with their work. An interesting apology for this sort of activity is to be found in the introduction to Attwell M. Y. Baylay's *Century of Collects* (Alcuin Club Prayer Book Revision Pamphlets, No. III). Baylay does not make any appeal to antiquarian principles. His argument is from the necessity of expanding the Latin of his originals in order to give their meaning clearly and in rhythmical prose. The rhythm he has in mind is Cranmer's. It would hardly be too much to say that for him there *is* no other rhythm that could be used for this purpose. He describes Cranmer as "determined to make the English of his collects rhythmical", and as perceiving that to do so he had "to use more words than are needed" to give the bare meaning. Describing his own method of work, Baylay says that he has not been "afraid of employing a much larger number of words" than were to be found in the Latin original. A fair sample of this work, with the Latin which Baylay gives side by side with it, is the following Leonine collect for St Stephen:

> Omnipotens sempiterne Deus, qui primitias martyrum in sancti Levitae Stephani sanguine dedicasti: tribue, quaesumus, ut pro nobis intercessor existat, qui pro suis etiam persecutoribus supplicavit.
>
> Almighty and everlasting God, who this day didst hallow the first-fruits of thy holy martyrs by the blood of the blessed Deacon Stephen: grant, we beseech thee, that we may be assisted by his prayers in heaven, who on earth was willing to pray even for his persecutors.

That is what might be termed a plausible piece of prose. It is reasonably neat, and follows the structure of its more terse original. But it does not go home to us as Cranmer's language does. It has no

traffic with the living speech of the day in which it was written. The mere use of the old second person singular, as the only form proper in addressing the Deity, is an embarrassment to us now. There are other embarrassments here. Observe the second part of the collect: "grant, we beseech thee that we may be assisted by *his* prayers in heaven, *who* on earth . . .". The syntactical contortion is dignified rather than direct. An ordinary member of a congregation might think it quite normal for a parson to talk like that in church, but he would be very surprised indeed if he heard it anywhere else. In other words, we are here asked to pardon a lack of colloquial force for the sake of preserving the ecclesiastical atmosphere. Observe, too, how the padding, the additional words put in in accordance with the translator's principles—"that we may be assisted by his prayers in heaven" for the terse "ut pro nobis intercessor existat" and "on earth" for nothing at all—is designed for the same purpose.

It is sobering to remember that, even in the days when the English Church said its offices in Latin, it was the custom to bring home to the congregation their part in the service by bidding their bedes in the plainest vernacular. There were no stylistic inhibitions about the priests who turned to the people and said:

> "Ye shulle stonde up and bydde your bedys in the worshepe of our Lord Jhesu Christ. . . . Also ye shulle bydde for the gwode man and the good wife, that the charite hid brought to pay, and for tham that it first voonden and longest holden ye shulle bydde for tham that this Cherche honour. . . .[1]

It is instructive to turn to one of the English Primers of pre-Reformation times. In the following petition the rhythm is not yet that of Cranmer, but it is interesting to note that the simplicity of the first three clauses gives way, in the second two, to a pairing of substantives which suggests the loose style of the great liturgist.

> God gyve grace to the quike, and to the deede reste, and forgyuenesse to the chirche, and to the kingdom pees and concorde, and to us synneris liif and endeles glorie.

It is, however, when we turn to the collects which appear both in the Prayer Book and in one of the medieval primers that the stylistic effect of the development of the language and the genius of Cranmer is most clearly seen. Take the collect for St Michael and All Angels. The Latin of Sarum reads as follows:

> Deus qui miro ordine angelorum ministeria hominumque dispensas: concede propitius, ut quibus tibi ministrantibus in coelo semper assistitur: ab his in terra vita nostra muniatur.

In the Primer given by Maskell, which is dated "before 1410", this is given as:

[1] A form of Bidding the Bedes, used on holy days in the diocese of Worcester, A.D. 1349. (*Forms of Bidding Prayer, with Introduction and Notes*, Oxford, 1840.)

> God, that in a merveilous ordre ordeynedist seruysis of aungels and of men, graunte thou mercifulli that oure liif be defendid in erthe bi hem that stonden nyg euermore seruynge to thee in heuene.[1]

Cranmer's version (with the word or two added, in the same tradition, by the revisers of 1662) is notably more florid:

> O everlasting God, who hast ordained and constituted the services of Angels and men in a wonderful order: Mercifully grant, that as thy holy Angels alway do thee service in heaven, so by thy appointment they may succour and defend us on earth.

The difference between the two English versions is by no means due merely to Cranmer's invention. The language has grown more supple. But Cranmer's own stylistic developments are of the telling force they are because they were in full sympathy with the developing genius of the language. They at the same time went with the current of the language and went beyond it, much as Shakespeare's went with and beyond the common speech of his day and the pentamenters of Kyd and Marlowe. Like Shakespeare, Cranmer is, by his very achievement, a hindrance to his successors in the same field.

It is difficult for us to conceive of vernacular prayers in a language which owes nothing to Cranmer. Yet to use language which echoes those old rhythms is to slip away from the speech of the day into a miserable ecclesiastical dialect in which our living thoughts cannot be expressed. To introduce into our services more recent rhythms may be a little discordant, but it is a graver fault, even of taste, to admit the sham.

While prayers intended for the service of the church should be in a language which has access to our deepest feelings, and so should be a natural not an imitated speech, they should certainly not be idiosyncratic. It is necessary to tie them to the common tradition as well as to release into them our individual devotions. No one can say how such prayers can be written. If it were possible to devise an exercise which might prepare the way for them, it would be the uninhibited translation, into the living language, of some of the terser collects from the old sacramentaries. But it must be admitted that it needs a writer of genius to be uninhibited in the face of a powerful tradition.

C. H. Sisson.

American Letter

EVANSTON REVISITED

I. Twice since the international meetings of 1954 the present writer has passed through the city of Evanston, once for an Anglican ordination and again *en route* to a learned conference at a Jesuit

[1] This prayer and the collect that follows are given from Maskell's *Monumenta Ritualia Ecclesiae Anglicanae*, Second Edition, Volume III.

university. It is not of course these associations of purely personal interest which provide the subject of this letter, but the thoughts to which these visits gave rise. What is worth remembering, after two years, of the summer gatherings of that *annus mirabilis*? The recent appearance of the official report of the World Council Assembly (*The Evanston Report,* S.C.M. Press, 1955) has again brought those fascinating days vividly to mind. One may note in passing that the *Report* is an excellent piece of work. It contains the necessary official documents, with enough narrative and report of discussion to preserve the flavour of the actual occasion. Proper balance is preserved and nothing essential is lacking—though the careful reader must remember that the reports of the discussions are given after the final statements which they arrived at, and the historical researcher of the future will doubtless consult magazine and newspaper reports for the immediate impression (and will be rewarded by such gems as the headline with which one of the Chicago papers referred to the Archbishop of Canterbury's indisposition at the beginning of the Assembly—"Rev. Fisher Ill at Opening").

Each of the three church meetings which occupied public attention in August 1954 had a somewhat different character from what was generally anticipated. The Catholic Congress at Chicago was, I suspect, looked forward to mainly in terms of spectacle. It did not wholly satisfy on that basis, but did produce a series of thoughtful papers, among which Dr Klein's on the Scriptures, Professor Fairweather's on the Sacraments, and the Archbishop of Utrecht's on Intercommunion deserve special mention. The planning of the Anglican Congress at Minneapolis was concerned largely with the papers to be read, but the chief memory of participants is likely to be the legitimate element of spectacle and fellowship—the packed auditorium at the opening service, the Missionary Mass Meeting in the St Paul Arena, the Eucharists in the cathedral according to one Anglican rite after another, the contacts at teatime under the marquee on the cathedral lawn. Similarly the World Council Assembly was expected, at least by some of its friends and publicists, to produce striking decisions in either the theoretical or the practical order. Its chief significance, however, is probably in the central fact that it happened, and happened at Evanston. Its occurrence demonstrated that the World Council is in regular existence; Amsterdam was an event, and with Evanston the World Council Assembly has become an institution. The very fact that the administrative decisions were somewhat technical is a sign of progress at this stage—the thrill of the founding is over and there is now business to be attended to. That both the Assembly and the Anglican Congress met in the Middle West was an important part of their impact on America. New York is fairly accustomed to archbishops and archimandrites, theologians from Germany and Anglican clerics from Australia. But such visitors are still somewhat surprising to the Episcopalians of Minnesota and the Protestants of the Chicago area—even though Chicago is the seat of Greek and Russian bishops, and was till recently the residence of the Nestorian Patriarch of the East, who has

now moved still further west, to California. The real diversity of the Christian world cannot be realized until one sees its representatives attempting to do business together. We all need by such experience to be shaken out of our natural assumption that our ethos and ideas will commend themselves to other Christians as soon as they are clearly explained to them. The meeting of the Assembly on undeniably American soil was necessary to enforce this truth on some American Christians, as illustrated by the simple hopes and simple disappointment reflected in so influential a publication as the *Christian Century*.

II. The "main theme" of the Evanston Assembly was "Christ the Hope of the World". Here also there were disappointments and surprises. Some doubtless expected that Christians could agree on their Hope, even though differing on the truths of Faith and the demands of Love— much as some came to the first Life and Work Conference thirty years ago with the expectation that where dogma divided service would unite. There is no such simple way of escape; serious Christian dialogue on any important topic reveals "our Oneness in Christ and our Disunity as Christians", to paraphrase the Faith and Order topic at Evanston, which spoke of "our Disunity as Churches". On Christian Hope the Assembly could not produce a resounding statement, but only a cautious comment on the memorandum submitted to it. This is really a good result, I think; it is better that we should exemplify our hope in Christ, even though we hope differently in him, than that we should be able to agree in smooth words on the topic. Whether we look more for new lives and a new world—or for a radical transformation from above—is the kind of difference which we do better to leave unresolved at the moment, appreciating each other's positions rather than striving either for victory or compromise. To paraphrase again, he who hopes for a better social order, to the Lord he hopes for it; and he who does not cherish any such hope, to the Lord he does not do so (Rom. 14. 6). A fascinating episode of the Assembly was the elimination of specific reference to the hope of Israel under the influence of two very different groups—Christians of the Arab world could not agree to anything which might suggest that a greater religious significance attaches to the affairs of the Republic of Israel than to those of any other nation, and Christian sympathizers with Zionism did not consider it helpful to make religious statements about Israel which might sound like political criticism of the Zionist state. I am profoundly convinced that the mystery of Israel after the flesh is not yet exhausted. But it was certainly wiser not to speak hastily on this subject, and probably better at the moment not to speak at all—after all, Rom. 9–11 still remains in the New Testament, and has a greater authority than our resolutions.

On other topics one may venture to comment that the discussion of various matters was of more significance than the precise conclusions arrived at. In a country where we have come close to thinking that only "non-theological factors" keep Christians apart, the great interest of the delegates in the Faith and Order section was something

of a surprise; this was the section which the largest number of delegates would have taken part in if they could have. That so much was said so well about the unity of the Church in Christ was admirable. This section of the Report received the approval of the Orthodox delegates in their separate statements, although they could not subscribe to the following sections commenting on the history of disunity and proposing various more or less concrete actions. Such a statement surprised some, although nothing in it would be unexpected to those acquainted with the course of previous ecumenical gatherings. The Holy Orthodox Church must do on such occasions what the Roman Catholic Church would do, if it were present—indicate that it still believes what it always has believed. I hope that this point of view, with all others, will be adequately represented at the Faith and Order Study Conference on The Nature of the Unity we Seek to be held at Oberlin, Ohio, in the summer of 1957. The organization of this Conference, the first large-scale Faith and Order enterprise on American soil, is perhaps the chief impact of the Evanston Assembly as such on the American scene. It should mark a significant step forward in American participation in all phases of the ecumenical movement.

What was said on the questions that some would call practical—evangelism, social and international problems, intergroup relations, and the vocation of the layman—is again perhaps less important than the fact that the questions were discussed and marked out as areas of Christian interest. What matters currently is not so much what was said in 1954 as what is being done in 1956. In reaction, I suppose, against the tendency to think of the layman purely in his ecclesiastical relations, the layman at Evanston was thought of mainly as the Worker. Only a large committee doing important business on a hot day would have produced so lovely a definition of the laity as "those members of the Church, both men and women, who earn their livelihood in a secular job and who therefore spend most of their waking hours in a 'worldly' occupation (not excluding housewives)". I am tempted to comment that this makes Jack (not excluding Jill) a dull layman. I would have liked to have seen some such approach as that represented in an article published in this journal in 1930 on "The Catholic Doctrine of Work and Play". However, one cannot cover all righteousness in one Assembly; what Evanston discussed was worth discussing, and some valuable follow-up efforts have been made, such as the conference on The Christian at Work in the World organized last fall by the Diocese of Albany.

III. In this Letter one cannot comment either on all aspects of Evanston that still seem of interest or on the various significant reactions to it—though perhaps one should admit that since Evanston there has been less general interest in what happened there, as such, than some had hoped for. A topic possibly ignored is the Roman Catholic reaction to Evanston, of which there has been more than may be commonly realized. I confine myself here to noting a significant group of articles which appeared in the first half of 1955 in the *American Ecclesiastical Review*, the approximate equivalent of the

Clergy Review doubtless familiar to many British readers of THEOLOGY. There were no Roman Catholic visitors or observers at Evanston, but certain members of the Roman Communion secured and read carefully the material issued to the press. Among them was John A. Hardon, S.J., of West Baden College, Indiana (the House of Studies of the Chicago Province of the Society of Jesus). Fr Hardon contributed three articles in March-May on "Background and Highlights of Evanston, "Evanston and Church Disunity", and "Evanston and Rome". They are critical as well as descriptive, and I believe are a valuable contribution to ecumenical conversation. They may be considered as saying what Roman Catholic delegates at Evanston would have said had they been able to be there to say it, and it seems to me admirable that this has been done. Fr Hardon's positive hope is that the member churches of the World Council will come to see the importance of the visible unity of the Body of Christ. At the end of his second article he quotes expressions to this effect from remarks of the Secretary-General of the World Council at the Lund Faith and Order Conference of 1952, with the cautious comment that—

> Without prejudice to their own position as members of the only true Church of Christ, Catholics may sympathize with the latter sentiments. In union wtih the Holy See, they can recognize here "the inspiration of grace from the Holy Spirit", leading all men to the unity of one Lord, one faith, and one baptism.

(with a reference to the Instruction of the Holy Office, *De motione oecumenica*, 1949). Equally significant is a brief article in the May number by Avery Dulles, S.J., on "The Protestant Concept of the Church", which glances at traditional views and speaks of the World Council as "a common confession that disunion is no longer tolerable". He sees a division among the supporters of the World Council about "whether dogma is more precious than unity or unity more precious than dogma". As combining both truth and unity he would present the Catholic Church as "a society of love as well as a society of law", in which—

> the religion of authority coincides with the religion of the spirit. For the authority of the Church is the power of her Spirit, and her Spirit is the Spirit of God.

Professor Joseph Clifford Fenton of the Catholic University of America is a conservative, even perhaps rigorist, theologian, whose contributions seem often intended to discourage a minimizing or liberalizing interpretation of papal decrees. He does not in this volume of the *Review* discuss the ecumenical movement, but offers some interesting relevant observations in an article on "Brotherhood in Catholic Theology", the main point of which is that while the "brotherhood" promoted by the National Conference of Christians and Jews is excellent, the only perfect brotherhood is our supernatural *fraternitas* in Christ. Yet we must admit that we do not always perfectly realize in action what we possess in principle—

> Catholics must be reminded that mere membership in the Church, which is the *ἀδελφότης*, does not constitute and guarantee that the life of the brotherhood, the life of sanctifying grace, is actually being lived. It is unfortunately possible to be, in this world, *in statu viae*, a member of the supernatural brotherhood in Christ and at the same time to live in a way utterly unworthy of that brotherhood (p. 203).

Is not the frank recognition of this distressing fact a close approach to what was intended by the statement, which some have found puzzling, in the Faith and Order Section of the Evanston Report that the Church like the Christian is *simul justus et peccator*?

> In each Christian there is both the "new man" who has been created and yet must he put on daily (2 Cor. 5. 17) and also the "old man" who has been crucified with Christ and yet must be daily mortified (Col. 3. 1–5). (*Report*, p. 84.)

To what extent such phrases apply to the Church, or parts of it, corporately, as well as to all its living members individually, is of course a further question which I cannot embark on the discussion of here.

IV. One's final impression of all the meetings of 1954 is that they were significant because they were external expressions of genuinely existing realities. Non-Roman Catholicism is a reality—the Anglican Communion is a reality—and the degree of unity in Christendom to which the activities of the World Council correspond does genuinely exist. We are not trying to put something over on the Christian world, but to bring to appropriate expression something which is there already, a genuine oneness through all our divisions (including divisions as to what the nature of our unity and our divisions is). Incidentally for Anglicans in America, as I believe also in Great Britain, there seems to be a sense of more genuine oneness on the world-wide and national than on the local level; but that is also another question. Having recently had the privilege of taking part in a World Council Mission, as well as in other activities of the Council, especially in the field of Faith and Order, I am happily aware of the reality of the fellowship which each common action brings to more clear and defined expression. And we shall see what further growth the future brings forth.

E. R. Hardy.

Finding and Fostering Vocations[1]

1. Where the Church is being true to her own vocation to "be the Church", vocations to her ministry can confidently be expected to arise. There is no difference in *kind* between the vocation of a priest and the vocation of the whole Church to be priestly. All are under

[1] The substance of a speech made at the St Albans Summer Diocesan Conference supporting the motion: "This Conference believes that the privilege of finding and fostering vocations to the Sacred Ministry belongs pre-eminently to parish priests and their people."

vocation, clergy and laity alike, the one primary call to be the People of God, to be Christian Men, to be Saints—in other words, to be the Church.

The world has been described as "a godless society of highly developed individuals". In the world, but in absolute contrast to it, stands the Christian Church. It is the Vocation Society. Not self-chosen, but God-called; not a gathered club, but a given community, with roots stretching down to the call of Abraham. Our Lord died to bring the Christian Church into existence and lives in it now in order that it may be true to its vocation to the world, active, missionary, seeking to bring men in—true to its vocation as the Body of Christ.

This is the Priesthood in which all men share. But the vocation to minister to the Church cannot be performed by all and is not indiscriminate. It is our Lord's special vocation to men within the Body whom he calls out to bear a specialized function. The Ordinal describes it "of so great excellency . . . weighty an office and charge . . . to minister the doctrine and sacraments and the discipline of Christ . . . to be Watchmen and Stewards of the Lord". It must at all costs be made clear that the word "vocation" is in the passive tense, nothing that we do, but all that God does. Especially must this be stressed where the proud family announce that "Jimmy is thinking of going into the Church". This implies choice on Jimmy's part and is presumptuous. Our business is to find not choosers but chosen.

2. It is sometimes said that there are fewer vocations nowadays. This must not be taken to mean that Almighty God is not calling, but rather that his call is going by unheard. Vocations from on high are more likely to be heard and answered where parish priests and their people set out to rediscover the vocation which they share—where in the Vocation Society men are coming overtly and knowledgeably to offer their own particular lives and bring their gifts and talents into the common life. The best setting for this is at the Holy Eucharist, because there is commemorated the redemptive act of a living Lord to whom the beloved community of the Church owes its very existence and present vocation. They make, to take one example, where there is an offertory procession at the parish eucharist, an offering of bread at the outset of the service as a token of what they are and have come to do. "I never knew before," said a dentist in the north to a friend sitting in the patients' chair, "how much my work was connected with the offertory." All take as full a part as possible. In this family atmosphere the work of the parish priest is plain to be seen, ministering the Sacraments, preaching the Word, absolving, baptizing. The whole climate is vocation. Children grow up in it and absorb its meaning. Once a parish gets this sense of a vocation life, the Holy Spirit calls out whom he will.

This is the only way the writer can account for the fact that in the past twelve years in his parish seven men have come forward for ordination. Even so, this number is small compared with some others; there is one parish in the north with the same emphasis where thir-

teen men came forward in five years. These men have been called, they have emerged. It may be relevant to quote from a letter to the writer from one of those ordained from his parish. He writes: ". . . I suppose the greatest thing in my life is that I was nourished and bred in a Christian family, but the church I have always regarded as my own—where I belonged—is St John's, and I think that its value as a seed-bed could not easily be overrated. I think I was never conscious of being forced, but within the context of that community my vocation matured naturally. The debt could never be measured, but that, and remarks you let drop just once or twice, 'If you ever happen to be a priest . . .', quite natural remarks never forced, had their effect." And then he adds significantly: "What actually pushed me was not you or St John's at all, but you were one of the first people I talked to as soon as I became conscious of it."

So that the word "find" of vocations needs further definition. For we do not find. Almighty God is to be trusted to do that. But it is possible to say "find" in the sense of *recognize as present*. Similarly to "foster" does not mean to incubate. In talking to a likely lad, one may encourage him to see a vocation as a real possibility among other lines of work. To foster is to encourage, but it is wiser to say too little than too much, except in unremitting prayer. Otherwise if it is thought that the finding is all "up to us" mistakes will be made. The man who exhibits a love of vestries, exaggerated obeisances and general "church tricks", has not necessarily a vocation any more than the boy who arouses admiration by his arrangement of the flowers. A Church paper printed some time ago a letter from a man scourging C.A.C.T.M. for rejecting his candidate. "To hear him read the lessons," he grieved, "is an experience."(!) "Finding" must involve discernment at a deep level.

3. What are the characteristics of a vocation that are to be discerned? The chief one would seem to be its negative character. A man submits himself to a selection centre because he cannot get away from an inner impulsion to Holy Orders in spite of other competing claims. He tests this out further at his theological college. He has frequent doubts. Yet he is unable to get away from it. In some instances, even, he would prefer not to be ordained. One such went to his Principal at the end of his course and said that he was unable to go through with it. The reply was given: "You have many gifts; why not teach, do social work, or something else?" The man thought for some time and eventually replied: "There *is* nothing else." The Holy Spirit appears gently and relentlessly to cut off all other avenues and all the lines of retreat. On the other hand, a clear-cut notion of being ordained straightway to a hospital or school chaplaincy or some other specific type of work may be open to possible question because of some unrecognized ulteriority. As the Principal of one theological college has put it: "You must be willing to come and be trained for a completely blind date."

4. There are, however, other ways in which vocations are sought. In one diocese the third Sunday in Advent is set aside as "Ministry Sunday", and before that day every church receives a poster to dis-

play entitled "WHY NOT YOU?" There is also an issue of pamphlets. Of these last a correspondent from the same diocese writes as follows: "There is a whole series of pamphlets, some purely Anglican and some giving Free Church information as well. They are particularly useful for careers nights at schools and we have a panel of speakers which includes Free Churchmen prepared to speak. The week before Advent III a letter is sent to the headmasters of all the Independent, Grammar, and Secondary Modern Schools as well as the Technical Schools asking for the needs of the diocese to be remembered in the opening act of worship—it is made clear that the President of the Free Church Council associated himself with the request and a suitable prayer was enclosed . . . we have a recruitment committee here which serves to create confidence and good will. . . ."

Such methods have obvious attractions, but scarcely less obvious dangers. The Church of God must not be betrayed into canvassing and hawking the Ministry round. Another danger is that vocation to the Priesthood should be equated with secular careers, a danger made more acute where schools and technical colleges are out of touch with the Church's life. There is also the question whether it is satisfactory that the Anglican and Nonconformist ministries should appear to be equated. It is perhaps regrettable that the word "recruit" was ever coined. It savours of prodding, chivvying, and conscription. No one on the mission field would try to recruit a native ministry from without. It is from baptism onwards, within the life of the people of God, that hope for future vocations must lie.

The subject of vocation must be fully aired, sermons preached, children instructed—particularly confirmation candidates, so that no information is in danger of being withheld. But the one primary task is to build the Vocation Society, the Church of God, so that in this setting, and all the information having been given, the Lord can call out those whom he chooses for service. To try to force or in any way to hurry vocations along is a sign of anxiety. Where the Church is being true to her own vocation to "be the Church", vocations to her ministry can confidently be expected to arise.

W. M. A. Potts.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. A. E. Baker is Rector of Moor Monkton and Canon and Prebendary of Apesthorpe in York Minster.

The Rev. E. S. Gabe is Assistant Curate of St Andrew's, West Kirby, and a visiting lecturer at St Aidan's College, Birkenhead.

Mr C. H. Sisson is a civil servant.

Dr Hardy is Professor of Church History at Berkeley Divinity School.

The Rev. W. M. A. Potts is Vicar of St John's, Harpenden.

CORRESPONDENCE

THEOLOGICAL VERBOSITY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I feel that it is high time that some protest was made against the extreme verbosity which has come to characterize the writings of many modern theologians, chiefly those of the Continental Protestant schools.

The English translation has just appeared of the second part of the first volume of Dr Karl Barth's *Church Dogmatics*. It contains, on a rough calculation (for I have not counted the words individually), about half a million words and it costs fifty shillings. We are told that the first half of volume four is shortly to appear, so the complete work will presumably consist of at least eight half-volumes. If their size and cost are the same as those of the half-volume that has just appeared, the whole work will contain about four million words and will cost twenty pounds; if there are more than eight half-volumes the size and cost will be proportionately greater.

It is possible to read a book rapidly without skipping at the rate of about four minutes a thousand words, or fifteen thousand words an hour. Devoting five hours a day to reading Dr Barth and working a six-day week (for servile work ought not to be done on Sunday) this will mean 450,000 words a week, or about nine weeks for the whole work. As Dr Barth has declared that nobody has the right to set up as a serious critic of his theology who has not read the whole of his works, this would seem to put him in a fairly safe position; there are other works of his in addition to the *Church Dogmatics*.

Now if the work was so packed with information that it could not possibly have been written more concisely we should have to make the best of a bad job; nobody complains of the size of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, but then nobody tries to read it from end to end. We should have to resign ourselves either to making the necessary inroads upon our lives and our bank-balances or to abandoning the right to be serious critics of Dr Barth. It is, however, perfectly clear to anyone who samples Dr Barth's writing that his work would have lost nothing in content and would have gained much in clarity if he had written it at one-third of the length. It would even then be much longer than the Bible, and whatever we may expect of Catholic scholastics, we might reasonably suppose that a theologian for whom the Bible is the sole repository of Christian doctrine would leave his readers a little more time to read the Bible itself. Dr Barth's disciples may well find themselves in the position of having left the commandments of God in holding fast the traditions of men.

On the basis of the above calculation, and supposing (this is certainly a very moderate estimate) that a thousand theologians and students will read the whole work, the fact that it has been written at three times the necessary length will involve an unnecessary ex-

penditure of about 120 years of human labour and of £13,000. And we are told that for every idle word that they utter men will have to answer on the day of judgment! I wish quite seriously to suggest that for a writer to involve printers and readers in unnecessary labour on this scale through sheer verbosity partakes of the nature of sin.

May I add that I have no special desire to attack the distinguished theologian whose seventieth birthday is just about to be celebrated by his admirers. Dr Emil Brunner, Dr Karl Heim and many others equal Dr Barth's verbosity in ambition if not in achievement. They would perform a real service to their readers if they would ponder the following words from the preface to Suarez, *De Caritate*, disp. xiii:

> "The primary cause, gentle reader, of the unusually brief form in which the following treatises on Hope and Charity are published was the fact that even the members of the very school over which Suarez presided at Rome, during the time when he lectured on these subjects, became wearied of extremely diffuse and excessively elaborate dissertations. Wherefore he readily bowed to the precepts and wishes of that school, such was the simple sincerity of this noble doctor."

O si sic omnes!

Yours faithfully,
E. L. Mascall.

Christ Church,
Oxford.
2 *June* 1956.

BIBLE TRANSLATIONS

To the Editor of Theology.

Sir,

In your May editorial you seem to quote with approval a suggestion from Newcastle-on-Tyne that Mr J. B. Phillips' version of the New Testament epistles is suitable for public reading in church. I agree that we need "permission soon for use in our liturgy of some scholarly translation into the language of the people". But Mr Phillips' book would not meet this need, and if anyone were to ask "Was that the Bible you were reading?" we should have to answer "No". The book is surely a paraphrase and an interpretation rather than a translation. I write on board ship without my Greek Testament, but take one example, namely the Palm Sunday epistle: St Paul tells us that Christ Jesus "emptied himself". The meaning of this phrase has been discussed for ages. Mr Phillips settles it by telling us that he emptied himself of *privilege*. That may or may not be what St Paul meant; it certainly is not the Bible. The whole book is riddled with these arbitrary interpretations. The Revised Standard Version of the Bible seems to provide what the Newcastle clergy are after.

Muritai,
New Zealand.
15 *May* 1956.

Yours, etc.,
E. Giles.

WAS LUTHER A NOMINALIST?

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

It was interesting to read, in the June issue, the discussion of the relationship between Luther's doctrine and that of the Occamists. It is doubtful, however, whether Dr Haegglund's method of simple comparison between the early works of Luther and those of the Occamists really does justice to the issues involved in the controversy. It is disconcerting, for instance, to find a discussion of the sources of Luther's thought in which the name of St Paul nowhere appears. Furthermore, the case for an Occamist origin of Luther's thought cannot fairly be said to rest upon the view that "it was in accord with that of the Occamists". On any showing, Luther was a brilliant and revolutionary religious thinker, and it would plainly be foolish to regard him as a simple continuator of late medieval thought. A much more serious case, however, might be made out for the view that the questions he asked, and the terms in which he asked them, were derived from Occamist theology, and that this theology influenced his approach to the writings of St Paul. He read the epistle to the Romans through spectacles manufactured by Occam.

Put in this form, the case for Occamist influence has perhaps rather more substance; indeed, so great was the dominance of that tradition in the universities of the 15th century, that it would be in no way surprising if it were found to be the starting-point of Luther's thinking. There is, moreover, a continuity in the fundamental theological interests of Luther and Occam. Occam's theology hinged upon the question, How can a man be accepted by God? To him, the older view that God's acceptance should be determined by human merit, by a man's possession of the habit of charity (even if this habit had been infused into him by the grace of God) was an intolerable interference with the sovereign liberty of God. God cannot be bound by human necessity. From this point sprang the double definition of justification. The system of acceptance through the re-creation of the redeemed by the infusion of charity was left untouched; but beside it Occam placed the insistence that there was no absolute necessity (*necessitas absoluta*) for God to have connected salvation with the transformation of men. He could as well have chosen the murderer, had he so willed, as the saint. The liberty of the illimitable will of God is therefore saved by the affirmation that every good thing (including the whole way of salvation in the Christian life and the Catholic Church) is only good because it has been declared so by God's arbitrary command: "Eo ipso quod voluntas divina hoc vult, ratio recta dictat quod hoc est volendum."

The fact remains, however, that this vindication of divine liberty is an unreal one; it is merely based upon the consideration of what God could in theory have done had he wished to do something else. For Luther, the question, How man can be accepted by God? was an

intensely personal one. He felt that no way of salvation through merit lay open to him; yet, as he understood it, the traditional practice of the medieval church was precisely such a system, and had been retained by Occam as being the thing which God actually *has* ordained, whatever else he might have done. Luther, in consequence, takes Occamism to a more extreme conclusion. The ordained mode of salvation is simply obliterated from the system; the untramelled choice of God, which was previously a mere theoretical possibility, is now conceived as God's actual mode of working. P. Vignaux has pointed out the impatient rejection of the merely hypothetical which strikes a new note in the Commentary on the Sentences: "Caritas, quidquid sit de possibili, est de facto . . ." God's arbitrary will ceases to be a hypothesis held in reserve; it becomes the mode of salvation of every individual. Merit, even merit given by God, is nothing at all; grace is everything. Men are saved by the simple decree of God.

It is at this point that the teaching of St Paul becomes important. So far, the suppression of the actually ordained order, as Occam conceived it, has left man face to face with the decree of God, but with no way of knowing whether that is for his salvation or damnation. If we say that we can know this only through the presence of the grace of charity in our lives, we are, to all intents and purposes, back in Occamism. The way out of this dilemma was opened to Luther by the doctrine of justification by faith. If we have a lively faith in the promises of God, we are saved; and this is the only response which we can give to God's decree of salvation. Luther is therefore able to complete his radical modification of Occamist thought. We are saved by the arbitrary decree of God, which is the actual, and not merely the ultimate, mode of salvation. Our response to this election is faith in God's promises. The Occamist ship sails home to the now familiar Protestant harbour of justification by faith alone.

To say that Luther found in the Epistle to the Romans the solution of the stresses found within Occamist theology, does not, of itself, tell us whether what he found was the true Pauline doctrine of justification or a heretical modification of it. That is another question; admittedly, a much more important one.

Pembroke College,
Oxford.
6 *June* 1956.

Yours faithfully,
C. Morris.

BOOK REVIEWS

Theology of the New Testament. Vol. II. By R. Bultmann. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. S.C.M. Press. 25s.

This completes the English version of Bultmann's *Theology of the New Testament*, the first volume of which was reviewed in Theology in June 1953. It consists of two sections of unequal length—Part III, "The Theology of the Gospel of John and the Johannine Epistles",

and Part IV, "The Development toward the Ancient Church", together with a brief but important Epilogue on "The Task and the History of New Testament Theology".

The English reader would be well advised to start with this Epilogue, for in it Bultmann explains his own aims in writing his book and his attitude towards his predecessors in the field. He says: "The presentation of New Testament theology offered in this book stands, on the one hand, within the tradition of the historical-critical and the history-of-religion schools, and seeks, on the other hand, to avoid their mistake which consists of the tearing apart of the act of thinking from the act of living and hence of a failure to recognize the intent of theological utterances" (pp. 250 f.). Or, in other words, Bultmann's New Testament theology is "existential", for he maintains that the theological investigator should "keep himself questioning—or knowing the questionability of—all human self-understanding, in the knowledge that existential understanding of one's self . . . is real only in the act of existing and not in the isolated reflection of thought" (p. 241).

The Johannine section, about a third of the book, contains four chapters. The first of these consists of a brief exposition of the historical position of John; Chapter II, "Johannine Dualism", deals with the world and man; III, "The 'Krisis' of the World", with the incarnation of the Word and revelation; IV, "Faith", with man's response. Here particularly Bultmann's own peculiar views seem to colour his presentation—the title of a sub-section, "Faith as Eschatological Existence", is significant. For the proper appreciation of Bultmann's treatment of the Fourth Gospel some acquaintance is necessary with his Commentary, unfortunately not yet available in English. Without the detailed support which it offers for conclusions which Bultmann accepts in his "Theology", much of his treatment of the Gospel must appear somewhat arbitrary.

Part IV also contains four chapters—"The Rise of Church Order and its Earliest Development", "The Development of Doctrine", "The Core of the Development" ("Christology and Soteriology"), and "The problem of Christian Living".

In this one may note how Bultmann avoids the error of divorcing theology from life, and also the masterly way in which he handles his material. In particular, it is often illuminating to have the Apostolic Fathers cited along with the New Testament writings. Occasionally, however, Bultmann appears to put the cart before the horse, as in the paragraph on p. 166 which begins "Related to Barnabas is *Hebrews*".

This is not an easy book either to understand or, for that matter, to review. It takes a great deal as demonstrated which most English readers will regard as insufficiently established. It is, understandably enough, written from a highly individual standpoint, and virtually ignores all non-German work. Moreover, the translation is infelicitous, and much too close to the German to be readily understandable. But for the reader who already has some knowledge of the subject the effort that will be needed to master it will be well rewarded, for

when all is said and done, this represents the fruit of a lifetime's study and reflection by one of the greatest living New Testament theologians.

J. N. Sanders.

Peterhouse,
Cambridge.

Moïse—L'Homme de l'Alliance. Desclée et Cie. N.p.

This book of essays was originally published as a special number of the review *Cahiers Sioniens*, which is concerned to examine the common roots of Judaism, Christianity and Islam. An earlier volume, *Abraham, Père des Croyants*, published in 1951, appears to have received little notice in this country. It will be a pity if this book suffers the same fate, for it is of considerable interest.

The various writers use the full resources of critical scholarship (without forfeiting the *imprimatur*), and take into account the evidence of the Dead Sea Scrolls. The figure of Moses is traced from such remnants of history as may be discovered, through the Bible and intertestamental literature, to the developed thought of Rabbinic Judaism, the Church Fathers, and the Koran. Moses is clearly a decisive influence in them all.

In a short review only a few points of interest can be selected for comment. The late Renée Bloch's essay on the Rabbinic tradition is masterly. His copious quotations show in a fascinating way how Moses grows in stature and acquires messianic character. Not only is he the liberator and lawgiver, but he is the good shepherd, mediator and intercessor, shares the sufferings of his people, and even his death has expiatory significance. With all this, he remains the meek servant of the Lord. It is thus not surprising that the Church was quick to see in him the type of Christ, and Jean Daniélou—whose work on typology is well known—uses the works of Gregory of Nyssa to draw together the main lines of the thought of all the Greek Fathers in a brilliant short essay. Géza Vermès brings evidence to show that the figure of Moses, more than anything else, binds together the many expectations and ideas of the Jews at the time of the coming of Christ.

With these facts in mind we should expect Moses to be a far more important influence in the Gospels than appears on the surface. But Albert Descamps' essay on this subject is disappointing. Using the material collected by J. Jeremias in his article *Μωυσῆς* in Kittel's *Wörterbuch*, he hesitates to venture into the bolder Mosaic interpretations which a volume of this character might well put forward. This is an important issue, because it lies near to the heart of the problem of Christology in the Gospels. The reason why Mosaic typology became submerged in them can be well understood from St Paul's struggle with the Judaizing Christians. Paul Démann contributes an interesting essay on this subject, rightly insisting that the key to understanding St Paul is to remember that it was Judaizers,

not Jews, who were his opponents. But there is a suspicion of anti-Protestantism at one point in the argument of this essay.

Moses is type, not only of Christ, but also in a sense of Mahomet. The divine message from the burning bush anticipates the experience of the prophet of Islam, and figures in the Sufic tradition of mysticism. Here are ideas which might well be fruitful in the much neglected field of the study of links between Islam and Christianity.

Finally, the book contains some interesting illustrations of Jewish and Christian artistic expressions of these themes, and an essay by Jules Leroy is devoted to an analysis of their place in the developing traditions.

Barnabas Lindars, S.S.F.

St Francis House,
Cambridge.

Through the Ages. The Story of the Christian Church. By the late Francis E. Barker. Church Information Board. 2 vols. 12s. 6d. each.

These two most attractive volumes should certainly, if anything could, entice the adolescent to the study of Church History. Where such interest has already been aroused there could be no more acceptable present or more useful addition to the school library. Indeed, one rather regrets that it was felt necessary to state on the title page that the work was sponsored by the Church Assembly Children's Council, since here is much that would be beyond children and is in fact worth a place in most training college libraries where "R.K." forms part of the curriculum. The facts that the author was not a professor in a university but (1934–55) a country parson in Hampshire and that his history began as a series of notes for his elder boys and girls indicate the spirit, the substance and the general method of his work. There is, for one thing, a subtle but pervasive atmosphere of enthusiasm for his theme and an eagerness to convey his own delight which more than compensates for any trivial errors incidental to residence in the country. There are the clear bright prose and the clean rounded paragraph which make for easy reading and the gleaning of notes by the class teacher. There are the "Exercises and Activities" at the end of each volume—plans for notebooks, topics for discussion, suggestions for pilgrimages and for local research. There are the really admirable illustrations, many fresh and drawn from local sources, while we confess that we had not realized how useful an ally the Church historian has in the archivist of *Picture Post*.

To attempt to cover the story of all Christendom from the *Acts of the Apostles* to the ecumenical movement on any scale is of course beyond one man's compass, but within the limits of the possible these two volumes would seem to hit the mean between the dry and dusty textbook calculated to destroy any interest in the subject and the learned monographs or treatises which scholars write for other professionals. Only industry and patience exercised over years could

have succeeded in covering so vast and varied a canvas. The potential public for such a survey so well done—in schools, colleges, societies, study-groups—must be enormous, and readers will find not only the old tales and arguments and controversies retold with brevity and clarity but also a continuous accompaniment of fresh anecdotes and quotations drawn from a wide range of reading and from a loving acquaintance with the local exemplars of great epochs and controversies. The penultimate chapter, "The World for Christ", with its pen-pictures of famous societies and pioneers, will please the evangelistic-hearted of all denominations besides demonstrating that this is a history which drives at action. The dominant idea throughout, however, certainly in Vol. II, is Evangelism linked with Worship; to show, to quote an odd sentence of Roger Lloyd, that "Anglicanism is a way of corporately following Christ"—first in these islands and then behind the flag throughout the habitable globe. That way, our author suggests, is as wide as humanity, and the tie which binds us is the Prayer Book, without which the Anglican Communion could hardly have preserved its unity. Such is the theme, and the execution is, as already said, better than we had any right to expect from one man's unassisted labour, and he at work in the shadow of death.

Criticism is silenced; a comment or two may be permitted if only because we are sure there will be reprintings and, we hope, translations to be marketed overseas by S.P.C.K. If such occasion offers, some slight emendations and rearrangement might prove helpful. Could the two volumes be set between one cover, so avoiding the repetition of the Preface, the Foreword and the Index to Vol. I, and so reducing the price? Vol. II becomes inevitably the more restricted story of Anglicanism at home and thence overseas; it would be a service to any teacher confined to the modern period if this second volume (or section) could begin with what is now the last chapter of the first volume, that on the Henrician Reform—a rearrangement which would, too, leave the first volume a more finished survey of the medieval period and the first attempts at reform on the Continent. There are one or two slips in the indices and not a few names of eminent personages mentioned in the text are lacking, as Cairns, Palmerston and Bishop King. Mr Gladstone, the most eminent of them all, escapes mention altogether. In the earlier volume it is surely a serious omission not to hear of Mother Julian and others of the great mystics. The bibliography is satisfactory as far as it goes, but would be improved by some pruning so as to permit the inclusion of one or two more useful titles than some that are inserted; Maisie Ward on pagan France could be exchanged for, say, *Doctrine in the Church of England* (1938) or for that mine of information, *Liturgy and Worship* (1932); Harford and Stevenson's *Prayer Book Dictionary* (1912) is by no means an exhausted quarry for the seeker after facts. A note additional to the useful information about outline maps could perhaps suggest the provision of *Heussi and Mulert* or of some other authoritative Atlas of Church History.

W. G. Addison.

Britford, Wilts.

1054–1954: L'Eglise et les Eglises. Neuf Siècles de douloureuse Séparation entre l'Orient et l'Occident. Etudes et travaux offerts à Dom Lambert Beauduin. Editions de Chevetogne. 2 vols. Pp. xvii+488+525.

Theologians, historians and "unionists" to the number of forty-four, two-thirds of them Roman Catholics, the rest Greek and Russian Orthodox, continental Protestants and one Anglican, all learned and wise men, have conspired to present Dom Lambert Beauduin on his eightieth birthday with a purposeful and erudite book. It might well be folly to attempt an appraisal of the result less cautious and reserved than the book itself gives, even though we concentrated on the purpose and left the erudition to take care of itself. This much can, however, be said at once. The non-Roman contribution is uneven and would not of itself give the book a sense of direction and of resources still to be displayed; good as it can be, it is not at its best. But the Roman contributors are coherent and sustained; if, like the forces of Lucullus, they are too small to be an army, they are too large to be an embassy. Let us hope that they are a school from which we also may learn.

How did it happen? How did the unity of the twelve Apostles, founded in the Lord and firmly placed in an eschatological context, become compatible with discussion, argument and debate, with heresy, schism and separation? This cross had to be borne from the beginning, as is clear from the whole of the New Testament and above all St Paul. *Oportet haereses esse;* but at first within the Church. Only gradually did "heresy" and "schism" mean what they have come to mean now. We have to accept a fact which, however, is disclosed rather than occurs. The Cross of Christ was a scandal among angels as well as among men; and Satan had to act. One can share this intuition, though its patristic distillation from the parable of the prodigal son is at least unusual. But granted the warfare in heaven, it becomes possible to admit that the division between East and West was potentially there from the first; and we can sympathize with the book's opening treatment of the whole story between East and West under the heading of "estrangement", a word taken over from the English and not translated, but used with all and more than its English meaning. The contrast of estrangement and affinity is made to provide the key for the whole of the two volumes. And it is a good key.

It opens up indeed a wide prospect for research and revaluation. Certainly all decent and comely principles of ecclesiology were violated; nor can it be said that the principles were not there to be observed. They operated, but operated partially. The essence of the disputes was theological; but there were factors at work which were not theological. It is possible that the book underrates these. It is admitted that Christianity is highly sensitive to its cultural medium; and it is noteworthy that while the impact of Islam has moved the language line in Africa and the Middle East, in Europe the Greco-Roman line still exists. An interesting off-shoot in the historical section is the tracing of a sort of north-east passage from Rome to

Kiev. Viewed from either end it is a thin line. But, assuredly, Kiev did not receive everything from Constantinople, nor does Russia automatically accept Byzantine inhibitions. Despite some fashionable argumentation as to the essential Hellenism of the East, it does not appear that Russian Orthodoxy can be emptied of all other content. Elsewhere the point has been made that before the Revolution of 1917 Marxism indeed was influencing the Orthodox revival of those days; now we are asked whether it is possible that a half-century of a Marxist régime is leading Russian Orthodoxy to make a short journey of seven centuries of Western analysis and rationalism. Then she will still be herself, and nearer us. A highly acute question! The weighty émigré contribution could be superseded by the opening of the road to Moscow, and this book would have to be rewritten. Meanwhile, scholasticism remains a distinctively Western phenomenon. We should be grateful that this theme has not been pressed all the way into Professor Toynbee's territory, though it is still an open question. At its best it must yet give the primacy to the truly religious factor, as is well shown in a generous approach to Judaism. The Jewish rejection of Christ is the fundamental schism which has made all the other schisms possible, and it was done in the name of fidelity.

Lest it should be thought that the concept of estrangement has led to a relative attitude to established positions, it should be said that nowhere in the book are the writers other than loyal to their representative capacities. On dogmatic questions they say what we should expect them to say, even to the round assertion by a Greek writer that the Orthodox Church has committed no errors. The problem is conceived at this stage as one of communication and approach. How can the opposing sides be said really to have rejected beliefs with which they have not lived? And who would now assert that past encounters have always been courteous and discreet, not to say wise and charitable? A more discerning approach to the traditions, the modes of speech and the faith of the other man is fully apparent; but it also means that their cherished beliefs have not yet been put into play. This is no pity; a new understanding has first to be cultivated. The suggestion of the concluding article, however, that the first stage is psychological could be improved upon. A moral commitment has been made, and handsomely. An important precedent is overlooked by the suggestion, not from a Roman source, that Pope Pius XII and the Patriarch Athenagoras should meet; Pope Eugenius IV was willing that reconciliation should take place at Constantinople, but that was long ago and did not propose a summit conference.

The Roman Church of to-day is not entirely that from which the East separated 900 years ago. The Reformation has intervened. And there is evidence here that it has cut the more deeply of the two. Why, asked a cardinal at the time of Florence, this attention to Greeks when our Germany is in danger? *Vis-à-vis* the East the Roman writers in this book feel their responsibility for their Protestants. This may seem a far-reaching statement. But nothing less would do justice to the Catholic attitude; nor would there be any other reason for including an attractive treatment by a Catholic writer of the debate

between Barth and Bultmann than the point of conscience that they ought to be there, even in the setting of the East-West theme. The suggestion is surely sound that contemporary Biblical studies assist the conversation with the Protestants, as the study of liturgies opens new ways to the East. But the Orthodox have something to say about the Western catastrophe, and their presence here is all to the good.

What is the road to be followed? The introduction reminds us that in the Tridentine period the Roman Church kept herself intact, recovered some lost ground and entered the new worlds. Still, the Tridentine period shows some signs of having reached its term. There is a fresher climate. And the occasion? By your leave, it seems that a new era of ecumenical opportunity was begun by an Assize Sermon preached in 1833 by one John Keble. For the Tractarian Movement was far and away the most important movement of the 19th century in its consequences for the unity of the Church. And that, not because it re-inforced Rome, but because it prepared the way for Faith and Order. And we are told elsewhere that the vocation of a Pusey may prove to be not less valuable for the future unity than that of a Newman. The one remained in his Church, the other left it. This does nothing, if it does not anticipate a profoundly new and sustained approach to the problems of corporate reconciliation.

It would be possible to saturate many more paragraphs with similarly selective references to this wide and wise book. Some would not be persuaded. Another selection might be made, for instance the exposition of theological discretion in the field of Mariology or the attack on the concept of a non-Roman Catholicism, and a polemical criticism could and would result. The symposium intends to be irenical; and is. The concluding article, while acknowledging that the diversity of views expressed is too great to be embraced in a common statement, discerns the unity of the work in the primacy of the object to which the writers have committed themselves; moreover, there can be no facile limits. The Protestants are rightly included, and it would be unreasonable to reduce the question of unity to the bare acceptance or rejection of the Papal claims. The debate is open. It is, however, the introduction, even more than the conclusion, which justifies the view here taken. As a retrospect of the historical divisions of the Church, the introduction is quite masterly. To cover the history of the subject through nearly two millennia in seventeen pages of balanced and impartial analysis is a classical piece of work; it is superb. This brilliant retrospect is also an encouraging prospect, generous and clear. The ice age is receding.

Let us, however, append a footnote. Vladimir Solovyov looked for an affirmative role of the Papacy in an historical theocracy and then placed the reconciliation of the Churches at the last point of time on the threshold of the Parousia. Already a disillusioned man, he was received into the Roman Church and yet remained an Orthodox. A very elusive article, written by an Orthodox, denies that Solovyov's behaviour was contradictory, whereas it was in fact eschatological. "Hold fast to your consciences," was the message, "and listen to Rome; pray that the word of the Roman Pastor may be worthy to

enter all hearts, and hope from Rome the new fact which can invite the Divine intervention." As the writer says in his own footnote, the ecumenism of Buchenwald and Auschwitz is deeper than that of Amsterdam and Lund. The unity of the end is already at work.

A. F. Dobbie-Bateman.

Frome.

Islam and Christian Theology. By J. Windrow Sweetman. Part II, Vol. I. Lutterworth Press. 31s. 6d.

This immense work on the theological relations of Christianity and Islam has now reached the third volume without surveying the debt of the scholastic theologians to Moslem authorities. This is still in reserve. The present part begins with an all-too-brief account of the relations between Christians and Moslems in the Islamic world during the decline of Arabian civilization from the 10th to the 14th century. This includes some quotations from Christian and Moslem authors, such as Agapius and Bar-Hebraeus, but is disappointingly meagre.

There follows a somewhat unnecessary summary of Christian learning independent of Islamic agency, and an account of the translators from Arabic books in Spain and Sicily. Most, if not all of this, is available elsewhere in a more readable shape. More interesting is a longer account of the first serious attempts to understand Islam as a religion in the Latin West, from Peter the Venerable to Raymond Lull. This leads to a "polemical climax". More than half the volume is occupied by extensive summaries of two Christian criticisms of the Koran and of Islam, and two Moslem criticisms of the Bible and of the doctrine of the Incarnation. This will probably be the most useful part of Dr Sweetman's book. But unfortunately the first of his four works, the *Confutatio Alcorani* of Ricoldo of Montecroce, a Dominican working in Bagdad about 1300, is accessible only in a printed edition (published in 1520, and therefore almost certainly unreliable) of a Latin translation of a Greek version itself translated "from the roman", which may mean Italian or Latin. Whether the book was originally written in Latin or in Arabic remains obscure, though it seems most probable that Ricoldo was writing in Latin, with "a competent mind, a high degree of proficiency in Arabic, a fairly wide knowledge of literature dealing with Islam tradition". But for what he says, we have very often only what Dr Sweetman makes of a dark and difficult text. The work of Nicholas of Cusa is always interesting, but is it about Islam, or a continuation, slightly veiled, of the discussion of "Catholic concordance" in a divided world? Of the Moslem writers Ibn Hazm is a literalist, and strains our patience. He may be worth refuting for his influence on Moslem tradition, but it is hard to find him otherwise interesting. Al-Ghazzali (1058–1111) is a great theologian, who knows perfectly well what he is doing when he pulverizes, from his own point of view, the clashing inconsistencies of three rival Christologies. But I doubt if Dr Sweet-

man has sufficient sympathy with the kind of theological interest that is common to him and his opponents to make a good commentator on this continuation of an ancient warfare. In an earlier volume (Part I, vol. I, pp. 87–8), he confessed himself baffled as to the identity of John Philoponus, an Alexandrian familiar to all of us, who, under Dr Wigram's guidance, have pursued the Monophysites beyond the limits of the theological courses at Oxford and Cambridge. We should want more on theological discussions between Moslems and Eastern Christians.

George Every, S.S.M.

Kelham.

The Nature and Function of Priesthood. By E. O. James. Thames and Hudson. 25s.

The Priesthood. A translation of the Peri Hierosynes of St John Chrysostom. By W. A. Jurgens. Macmillan, New York. $2.50.

The former professor of the history and philosophy of religion in the University of London offers in *The Nature and Function of the Priesthood* the result of twenty years' gathering of material on a subject of considerable importance to contemporary society. Dr James remarks that since the appearance of the late Buchanan Gray's *Sacrifice in the Old Testament* "no attempt has been made to pursue an objective anthropological and comparative inquiry into the nature and function of the institution (priesthood) as an integral element in social structure".

As we have come to expect from Dr James, the subject is not dealt with simply in general terms, but with extensive data drawn from the ancient world, from modern primitives and from the history of the great living religions, including Christianity; and his treatment has his characteristic lucidity. A glance at the table of contents indicates the compression which the author has brought to bear on this vast field in just over 300 pages. A full index and over twenty pages of bibliographical notes will enable the reader to follow up any particular topic which he wishes to investigate further in detail.

Specialists in the study of primitive peoples will find here an ample survey of magico-religious practice in such society. Those concerned with Egyptian, Mesopotamian and Old Testament studies will likewise find an interpretation of the role of seer and diviner, king, prophet and priest in the civilizations of the ancient Near East, on the lines of the so-called Myth and Ritual School, of which Dr James was a leading exponent a generation ago. The more philosophically minded lawyer will also be interested in the function of the priesthood in the evolution of law. And the Christian theologian, particularly if concerned with sacramentalism and penance, will find in Chapter V an historical assessment of the place of the priest in the development of the Christian Church. There is no doubt that in this book we have a masterly assembling of data, which makes it at the least an invaluable work of reference.

Dr James informs us, however, that it has been no part of his purpose "to pass judgment upon the validity of the beliefs and practices in any of the regimes and traditions brought under review in these pages". And he adds, "their function is independent of their truth and falsity". It is here, if anywhere, that any weakness lies. Yet we can excuse the author from taking us further, since any strictly philosophical or theological examination of the subject really requires a second and a much more difficult volume. Nevertheless, he does point out that "to-day one of the most pressing problems in our modern world, alike in the sacred and secular sphere, in Church, State and the Commonwealth of nations, is to find a unifying dynamic, such as the priestly tradition has supplied throughout the ages".

The vital question is whether the priesthood in our contemporary society can still provide any such unifying dynamic. Convinced Christians of the Catholic tradition will have no doubt about the answer: other Christians will answer with varying reservations. But, as far as our own country is concerned, the majority of people are not at all sure. That the priest matters less in our society than formerly is a fact that needs no underlining: the psychiatrist has for many replaced the confessor, cultural activities in no small measure provide the corporate emotional satisfaction for many who would formerly have found it in religious rites and ceremonies, lay experts on religion tend to replace ordained in places of learning, and even in the field of law and morals national councils rarely these days call in the advice of the priest. The confidence of the mass of people in the priest has declined considerably. Certainly many of the functions formerly exercised by the priesthood are now in the hands of laymen.

Yet, at the end of this scholarly book laying bare so much historically significant material, Dr James concludes that "the institution of priesthood has enabled struggling humanity to advance on life's pilgrimage with hope and confidence and with a sense of security by supplying a power to help and to bear, to renew and reassure, to cohere and conserve". This of the past: it now remains for another work, philosophical and theological rather than historical and comparative, to convince men why priesthood is still essential in a healthy society.

A smaller work specifically on the Christian priesthood is John Chrysostom's *De Sacerdotio*, newly translated by a young American Roman Catholic, Fr W. A. Jurgens. In view of the revived interest in Patristics at the present time this may be found welcome. The standard edition, which Jurgens regards as "the finest edition of the Greek that has yet appeared", is that of Nairn, which came out in 1906; and it has been used as the main text for this translation. There have been several English translations, but this is the first to appear for nearly half a century.

The book takes the form of a dialogue between Chrysostom and one Basil, who may or may not have been an historic person, and is clearly an apologia for the priesthood in the world of the 4th century, which, like our own, was troubled by conflicting ideologies. To the modern mind much of Chrysostom's argument will seem naive; but

there is also a great deal here that those who have been ordained will find of devotional value to themselves, since the main theme of the dialogue is, as the translator puts it, "to tell the glories of the clerical state, and of the perfection which the Judge will demand of him who holds an office of ecclesiastical authority".

D. W. Gundry.

University College of North Wales,
Bangor.

Modern Science and Christian Beliefs. By A. F. Smethurst. Nisbet. 21s.

This book has much to commend it. The author holds a first degree in chemistry and a Ph.D. for work in geology; he is also Chancellor of Salisbury Cathedral. He has thus had an intensive training in the intellectual and imaginative disciplines both of the physical sciences and of theology, and he moves easily in these two fields. Much of his exposition is lucid and vigorous; references are given but no academic dust hangs over the style.

The book falls into four parts. The first deals with certain features of scientific activity—its historical background; the presuppositions that underlie it and the limitations of view that often accompany it; and the moral status of the researcher's aims. The second discusses certain features of the physical, biological and social sciences which have a bearing on traditional Christian views; while the third takes up certain Christian doctrines which call for comment in a scientific age. The fourth presents succinct surveys of four modern schools of thought, such as existentialism and logical positivism, which have arisen out of the impact of science on our living and our reflection.

The best sections are those on the physical sciences, where the author comments on the significance for a thoughtful Christian of the theory of relativity, the equivalence of matter and energy, the principle of indeterminacy and the origin of matter; and on the biological sciences, where he discusses the nature of living matter, evolution and natural selection, and the "cruelty" of nature. On this last topic most of us perhaps get no nearer to facing the real problems than Bishop Gore's remark about the zoo: "I keep out of that place; it makes me an atheist in twenty minutes." It is a pleasure to find that Dr Smethurst shirks none of the difficulties. He recognizes on the one hand the possibility of "creative strife"; the fact that "pain and suffering can be the instruments or occasions of good"; and the conclusion that animals must be less sensitive to pain than human beings ("a dragon-fly will devour fly after fly immediately after its own abdomen has been torn from the rest of its body"—p. 137), and yet on the other hand that "there are other types of pain, suffering and cruelty present in nature"—he quotes the depredations of cancer and the tapeworm—"which have no spiritual value whatever, and which . . . are simply 'that which poisons Nature'" (p. 142). He obliges the reader to treat seriously the traditional Christian answer

to the problem: that these evils are due to the work of the devil. "We are left with the impression of a malign . . . spiritual force, not sufficiently powerful to frustrate the working out of the fundamental plan and purpose of God, but just sufficiently strong to . . . produce (biological) distortions or perversions which cause pain and suffering" (p. 143).

The other sections of the book are more vulnerable to criticism. His account of the influence of the endocrine glands, for example, seems rash; it is a highly speculative and probably false interpretation of the evidence to say that if a man "is born with an incurably overdeveloped suprarenal gland, it may well happen that as a consequence he shows a great tendency to anger and irritability" (p. 154). Certainly an authority like Mottram, whom Dr Smethurst quotes, is more cautious in his conclusions. But in any case the weight of psychological (as distinct from physiological) evidence—as, for example, that associated with the names of Dollard, Bowlby, Frenkel-Brunswik, Ericsson and Glueck—suggests that "a great tendency to anger" is much more likely to be due to a person's childhood relations with the adults who brought him up than to his suprarenal secretions. Although Dr Smethurst devotes fifty pages to "the nature of human character" he appears throughout this chapter to be writing from "outside" rather than "inside" his subject.

His view of the relation of miracle to scientific law is also questionable: he is on shaky ground when he asserts that "the essential presupposition of science is not that the universe is governed by a set of cast-iron, precise, exact and rigid laws, but that it is uniform and orderly rather than chaotic, inconsistent or arbitrary", and thus "the presuppositions and methods or science do not preclude rare exceptions to the established 'laws' of science" (p. 201). Again, although he quite rightly traces the characteristic assumptions of science to their historical source in the world-view of Western Christianity, it is a mistake in my opinion to go further and claim that these assumptions "can only be justified by the Christian faith" (p. 19). The cumulative influence of life in a technical society, where most actions are controlled by human choice rather than by the forces of nature, and of the intensive practice of scientific study and research, seem likely to produce in time a society where the only accepted assumptions about the nature of the universe are the scientific ones.

K. G. Collier.

St Luke's College,
Exeter.

New Concepts of Healing: Medical, Psychological and Religious. By A. Graham Ikin. Hodder and Stoughton. 12s. 6d.

Miss Graham Ikin's work on the frontier between Christianity and Psychiatry has been known for many years, and her present book is introduced and warmly commended by the Bishop of Lincoln. Like most of her earlier writing, this remains primarily a plea for co-operation between clergy, doctors and psychotherapists: it also gives

a brief, fairly comprehensive account of the ideas and practices at present operative in this field, and a few illustrative cases.

Miss Ikin has given some study to nearly all the schools, but evidently owes her strongest impulse to psychoanalytic literature and experience and to its elucidation of certain realities of the religious life. Thus, she says that "Modern psychotherapy is much closer in accord with the teaching and practice of Christ than much so-called Christian teaching has been" (p. 39); and while well aware of the pitfalls on the psychoanalytical side, she goes further when she writes (on p. 60) that "We must not forget that Christianity is religious, and unless we make our religion truly Christian, the more religious we are the more harm we will do". As to the types of therapy represented by "Christian Science", and some of the attempts at reviving a "ministry of healing" within the Church, she observes that "Much spiritual healing, though it may have dramatic successes, may later increase mental instability, unless healer and healed arrive at a deeper insight into the trouble".

This author does not lose sight of what this "deeper insight" may cost to healers or healed when they "risk the loss of their own faith in the search for truth and in their attempt to meet the needs of patients along the lines of medical psychology . . . and attempts to organize methods of healing within the Churches". It is rather odd, however, to find her giving as much attention as she does to some contemporary healers by prayer and imposition of hands whose aims and methods—whatever credence the reader may be induced to attach to their results—seem exclusively thaumaturgical and not likely to lead to "deeper insight into the trouble". In this field, where present efforts are bound to be tentative, there is all the greater need of a critical reserve. The rather indiscriminate selection of activities here held up as examples, the kind of dependence upon citation of authorities, such phrases as "scientific method of tapping God's infinite resources" and the coining of such a neologism as "altrovert" combine to give an unfortunately amateur aspect to the work of an author who has had wide experience of the subject for so long a time. Yet some of the author's own explanations of what is implied in the psycho-spiritual function of healing now show the maturing of long experience.

The book ends with a number of appendices, consisting of manifestoes by, and descriptions of, various guilds and other religious associations concerned with spiritual healing. These are informative and may doubtless be useful, though the aridity of such material considered as reading matter is in sad contrast to the absorbing interest of the subject. There is no doubt about the importance and urgency of the cause to which they are devoted. But the present confusing state of these studies, which the present work partly exemplifies, helps to show that the understanding of these central problems of human life never actually comes about by a syncretic mixture of the scientific and theological disciplines, however earnest—nor, we hasten to add, will it make general progress without sacrificial efforts to show that they are dealing with the same reality. That is the justi-

fication of this author's tireless insistence upon practical co-operation, in a sphere where the ultimate interests are identical, between workers who as yet possess no common language

PHILIP MAIRET.

LONDON.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ALLEN AND UNWIN: Joseph Klausner, *The Messianic Idea in Israel* (30s.).

BLACKFRIARS: *Mystery and Mysticism* [a symposium, translated from a special issue of *La Vie Spirituelle*] (9s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: Ian Moir (Ed.), *Codex Climaci Rescriptus Graecus* (30s.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS (for UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS): Edgar J. Goodspeed, *The Key to Ephesians* (19s.).

CHURCH INFORMATION BOARD: D. S. Bailey (Ed.), *Sexual Offenders and Social Punishment* (6s. 6d.).

T. AND T. CLARK: Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics.* Vol. I, Part 2: *The Doctrine of the Word of God* (50s.); G. R. Driver, *Canaanite Myths and Legends* (25s.).

COLLINS: Austin Farrer (Ed.), *A Short Bible* [Fontana Books] (2s. 6d.).

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS (London: CUMBERLEGE): Emil Oberholzer, Jr, *Delinquent Saints* (48s.).

CRUSADE: John R. W. Stott, *Fundamentalism and Evangelism* (1s.).

DENT: John Warrington (Ed.), *Aristotle: Metaphysics* [the 1,oooth Everyman] (7s.).

EPWORTH PRESS: C. Ryder Smith, *The Bible Doctrine of Grace* (22s. 6d.).

FORTUNE PRESS: Mary Grew, *Farewell in Eden* (6s.).

GOLLANCZ: Alexander Miller, *The Renewal of Man: A Twentieth-century Essay on Justification by Faith* (12s. 6d.); William J. Wolf, *Man's Knowledge of God* (12s. 6d.).

HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS (London: CUMBERLEGE): H. A. Wolfson, *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers* (80s.).

LONGMANS: G. W. H. Lampe, *Reconciliation in Christ* (6s. 6d.); H. F. Rall, *Religion as Salvation* (18s. 6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: W. M. Horton, *Christian Theology—An Ecumenical Approach* (25s.); Paul S. Minear, *Jesus and His People* (2s. 6d.); James Martin, *Did Jesus Rise from the Dead?* (2s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: William of St Thierry, *On the Nature and Dignity of Love* [newly translated by Geoffrey Webb and Adrian Walker] (3s. 6d.); Hugh of St Victor, *The Divine Love* [translated by a Religious of C.S.M.V.] (2s. 6d.).

NISBET: Paul Tillich, *Biblical Religion and the Search for Ultimate Reality* (8s. 6d.).

ST ANDREW PRESS: William Barclay, *The Gospel of Mark* (12s. 6d.; paper covers, 5s. 6d.); William Barclay, *The Acts of the Apostles* (10s. 6d.; paper covers, 4s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Stuart B. Jackman, *Angels Unawares* (4s.); George Herbert, *The Country Parson and Selected Poems* (8s. 6d.); E. H. Robertson, *Paul Schneider* (8s. 6d.).

SHEED AND WARD: Henri de Lubac, S.J., *The Splendour of the Church* (18s.).

S.P.C.K.: H. Burn-Murdoch, *Rome's Denials of Anglican Orders* (1s.); Harry Blamires, *The Faith and Modern Error* (15s.).

S.P.C.K.: (for the CHURCH HISTORICAL SOCIETY): E. W. Hunt, *Dean Colet and his Theology* (30s.).

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LTD.
GUILDFORD AND LONDON

S · P · C · K

THE FAITH AND MODERN ERROR

Harry Blamires **15s. net**

The number of laymen who are distinguished men of letters, writing Christian apologetic is one of the most hopeful and healthy signs of the present time. Mr Blamires, well known as a novelist on both sides of the Atlantic, is concerned to discover the false assumptions on which much so-called modern thinking is based and to confront men boldly with the stimulating challenge of supernatural faith.

*DEAN COLET AND HIS THEOLOGY

E. W. Hunt **30s. net**

This examination of John Colet's writings and letters is undertaken to portray the mind and character of the man justly famed as Dean of St Paul's, founder of St Paul's School, and leader of the Revival of Learning in England.

*THE HIGH CHURCH PARTY 1688-1718

George Every, S.S.M. **30s. net**

A clear division between the High and Low Church Parties only emerged after the Restoration and became clear-cut in 1689. Subsequent events hardened the differences, and gave bitterness to the resulting controversies. In a final chapter the author traces the relations of these controversies with the rise of Methodism, and with the beginnings of the Evangelical and Oxford Movement.

* *Published by the Church Historical Society*

S · P · C · K

G. L. Prestige

God in Patristic Thought

21s. net

Fathers and Heretics

12s. 6d. net

R. V. Sellers

The Council of Chalcedon

37s. 6d. net

B. S. Easton

Early Christianity

12s. 6d. net

C. R. Forder

The Parish Priest at Work

12s. 6d. net

P. F. Anson

The Call of the Cloister

42s. net

Ernest Best

One Body in Christ

25s. net